

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Soil Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_125473
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ANALYSIS OF TOPSOIL QUALITY CHANGES ACROSS SOIL GROUPS IN VIETNAM</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript lacks as it does not provide a brief overview of the number of samples collected, the research design, or the method of analysis. Additionally, it does not present a clear conclusion and fails to discuss the results effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate for the research; however, it does not adequately address the research gap.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive, as it omits details about the sample size, method of analysis, purpose of the study, key quantitative findings, and research approaches.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are inadequate. It does not include a description of the study area, combines the results and discussion sections, which should be treated separately, and lacks a conclusions section.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific correctness and technical soundness of the manuscript are undermined by a lack of detailed analysis of the results. It does not sufficiently convey the scientific meaning or implications.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is good, but it lacks the use of scholarly English.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fekede Terefe Gemeda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopia</b>